

CONTENT-RELATED EVALUATION GRID OF THE COMPLETE PROJECT PROPOSAL¹

For the application (No):

Name of the criterion	Point of the CPP/Plan	Score range/Score awarded*	Description of the criterion	Remarks of the Assessor
Assessment of the Complete Project Proposal (CPP)		Total: 230 points		
I. Quality of the town development concept - Local Development Plan		Total: 110 points	The CPP might be recommended for funding after being awarded at least 60% for the criterion I	
<u>I.1. Description of the town in terms of its conditions</u> - the assessment covers the quality of the presented description of the town, i.e. its consistency, transparency, accuracy, which has to contain in particular the description of: - its location, genius loci, natural/cultural heritage; - the current role of the town in the	LDP	0 - 5 points/	0 point – No description of the town was presented. 1 point – The description of the town was presented, but objective conditions of the town referred to the description of the sub-criterion were not presented accurately. No data in the possession of the town or LDM-tools were referred to (the specification of the situation in the town, including the comparisons with similar cities), or the presented description does not refer to all three obligatory dimensions. 2-4 points – The description of the town was	

¹ Stage II – for approx. 50 cities (project outlines), selected of 255 cities specified in the RDS at the 1st stage of the open call for proposals.

<p><i>settlement structure of the region and its key functions, including the role of the service centre for the neighbourhood and its relations with other (e.g. larger cities) centres of services which are not accessible in the town;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the condition of the town (documented based on statistics and results of studies), reflecting in particular: the demographic situation, forms of economic activity of the residents, property of the town and sources and the level of incomes of the residents and the town;</i> - <i>the current state of social activity of the residents, the level of social integration (including identification of groups threatened by the social exclusion) and forms of social activity of the residents and a sense of local identity of community;</i> - <i>the accessibility and quality of infrastructure and services for the residents, entrepreneurs and guests;</i> - <i>the condition of the environment,</i> 			<p>presented, but objective conditions of the town referred to the description of the sub-criterion were not presented sufficiently accurately. The data in the possession of the town were referred to exclusively to a smaller or larger extent, however incompletely. A LDM-tool was used either to specify the situation in the town or to compare it with similar cities. The presented description refers to all three obligatory dimensions.</p> <p>5 points – The description of the town was presented sufficiently accurately and consistently. Objective conditions of the town were presented in detail, including the use of correct data in the possession of the town or LDM-tool (the specification of the situation in the town, including the comparisons with similar cities). The presented description refers to all three obligatory dimensions and at least to one facultative dimension.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<i>natural resources, safety and health of the residents.</i>				
<u>I.2. Quality of the diagnosis of problems and barriers in the town development</u>				
<p><i>- The assessment covers the level of detail, credibility and accuracy of the performed diagnosis, including its basing on the mix of quantitative and qualitative data in the possession of the town or of other public entities (including on the Local Development Monitor as an additional source of information about the situation of the applicant, if compared with the comparable group), and on the surveys conducted in the local community - among stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>- The assessment covers the significance of the indicated problems, the accuracy of their prioritisation and the level of their impact on the lower pace of development/identified crisis situation, as well as the level of linkages and mutual dependencies of the indicated problems;</i></p>	LDP	0-15 points/	<p>0 point – No problem-based diagnosis of the town was performed or key nature of the identified problems for eliminating negative phenomena in the town, including their influence on lower pace of development, has not been demonstrated; no mutual linkages (mentioned in the sub-criterion) were demonstrated .</p> <p>1-5 points – a general diagnosis of problems was presented, but it was not performed or justified sufficiently in detail and accurately. By specifying the development problems/challenges, the quantitative data in the possession of the town or of other public entities were not referred to at all or to a minor extent and/or qualitative data were not referred to at all (including the studies on the local communities). No LDM-tool was used or it was used only declaratively (without any data) as an additional source of information about the problem situation of the applicant, if compared with the comparable group (or the accuracy of the selection of the group raises doubts). The presented description does not refer to all three obligatory dimensions. Key nature of the identified problems responsible for the presence of the significant negative phenomena in the town, including</p>	

<p><i>The results of the comprehensive analysis of the key areas for the development of the town were a basis for identifying key problems which trigger adverse socio-economic trends and contribute to weakening the urban functions and their further consequences in future. In particular, under in-depth diagnosis there was analysed demographic situation (changes in the age structure, birth rate, migration) and were identified the causes of crisis phenomena and their future effects for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>changes in the demand for services (public and market) and for technical/social infrastructure;</i> - <i>changes in the socio-economic potential of the residents of the town for the labour market and the competitiveness of local economy;</i> - <i>changes in the financial situation of the residents (incomes) and of the town (taxes);</i> - <i>the causes and effects of the economic activity of the residents and</i> 			<p>their important influence on lower pace of development of the town, has been demonstrated to a very small extent. The majority of the problems does not constitute important factors which determine the lower pace of development. The prioritisation of the problems and concentration of the adverse phenomena were not indicated or the mutual linkages/correlations were not presented.</p> <p>6-10 points – an insufficiently comprehensive diagnosis of problems was performed, which was not justified sufficiently accurately. By specifying the development problems/challenges, the quantitative data in the possession of the town or of other public entities were referred to to a larger or smaller extent; qualitative data (including the studies on the local community) were referred to a minor extent or their results were partially inadequate to identified problems. An LDM-tool was used as an additional source of information about the problem situation of the applicant, if compared with the comparable group of cities. The diagnosis covers main composite indicators, dynamics/trends, while indicating objective figures about the situation in the very town to a smaller extent. The presented description refers to all three obligatory dimensions.</p> <p>The key nature of the identified problems for the presence of the significant negative phenomena, including their important influence on lower pace of development of the town has been demonstrated to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<p><i>the competitiveness of local economy;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the causes and effects related to current and future level of social activity of the residents, social integration and sense of local identity, including the influence of the groups threatened by social exclusion (e.g. because of poverty, low level of qualifications) on development possibilities of the town,</i> - <i>the condition of the cooperation with key institutional partners which possess resources which may increase the development potential of the town,</i> - <i>the degree of adjustment of range and quality of services and infrastructure in terms of the needs of the residents,</i> - <i>the level of the environmental problems,</i> - <i>the sense of safety and health condition of the residents.</i> 			<p>the medium extent. A smaller number of the problems do not constitute important factors which determine the lower pace of development. The prioritisation of the problems and concentration of the adverse phenomena has been partially conducted; the mutual linkages/correlations (causal and others) were presented partially.</p> <p>11-14 points – A comprehensive diagnosis of problems was performed as a rule and justified in a reliable way, with some reservations. While specifying the problems/challenges, the quantitative data in the possession of the town or of other public entities were referred to in the majority of cases. To a larger or smaller extent qualitative data (including the studies on the local community) were referred to (some groups of stakeholders were included). Most of their results were adequate to identified problems. An LDM-tool was used as an additional source of information about the problem situation of the applicant, if compared with the comparable group of cities. The diagnosis covers both composite indicators, dynamics/trends and depicts the situation in the very town in the context of most of the discussed spheres (both based on data and by means of a contextual description - causes, effects, the scale of problems). The presented description refers to all three obligatory dimensions and at least one facultative dimension.</p> <p>The key nature of the identified problems for the presence of the significant negative phenomena,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>including their important influence on lower pace of development of the town has been demonstrated in most cases. Minor part of the problems does not constitute important factors which determine the lower pace of development (or such problems were not presented). The proper prioritisation of the problems has been presented as a rule; the concentration of most of the adverse phenomena has been partially indicated; the mutual linkages/correlations (causal and others) were presented partially.</p> <p>15 points – A reliable and comprehensive diagnosis of problems was performed and was sufficiently justified. By specifying the problems/challenges, the most adequate quantitative and qualitative (including the studies on the local community) data in the possession of the town or of other public entities were referred to. Large share of stakeholders was included in the studies. An LDM-tool was used as an additional source of information about the problem situation of the applicant, if compared with the comparable group of cities. The diagnosis contains a detail contextual description of the problems (its scale, significance, causes, effects) and the data both on the dynamics/trends and the situation in the town in all the discussed dimensions. The presented description refers to all three obligatory dimensions and at least two facultative dimensions.</p> <p>The key nature of the identified problems has been clearly demonstrated as a cause of the significant</p>	
--	--	---	--

			adverse phenomena, including their important influence on lower pace of development of the town. The proper prioritisation of all the problems, their mutual linkages (causal and others) were fully presented.	
<p><u>I.3. Analysis of potential and strengths of the town</u></p> <p>- The assessment covers the accuracy, adequacy, significance and rationality of the analysis of the potential/strengths (i.e. the use of relevant data, premises for deeming the identified aspects as development potentials and proving their significance for the development of the town and solutions of the diagnosed problems).</p> <p><i>In particular, competitive advantages of the town based on tangible and intangible internal resources (social, economic and environmental) were identified.</i></p> <p><i>The analysis of stakeholders was a basis for identifying key entities (employers, public institutions, social</i></p>	LDP	0-5 points	<p>0 point – No potentials/strengths of the town were indicated or they are not related to/have no impact on solving the identified problems/ the town development.</p> <p>1-4 points – The potentials/strengths of the town were indicated by specifying to a smaller or larger extent that part/most of them are of a development nature and may significantly contribute to solving the identified problems/ the town development (some are unjustified, inadequate or not related to the identified problems).</p> <p>5 points – It was proved explicitly that all the identified potentials/strengths of the town are of a development nature and significantly contribute to solving the identified problems/ the town development (all of them are justified, adequate or related to the identified problems).</p>	

<p><i>partners) which will strengthen the development potential of the town under the cooperation. Key products (potentials) of the town were simultaneously identified, to be or to become a basis for cooperation among local stakeholders and for the creation or further development of production chains of local products and for enhancement/creation of the added-value chains (enhancing the welfare and development potential of the town).</i></p>				
<p><u>I.4. Objectives of the town development</u> - <i>The assessment covers the legitimacy and feasibility of the objectives and their adequacy for the identified problems and potentials. In particular, the assessment covers:</i> - <i>the linkage between the objectives and the key problems, including the degree of counteracting the adverse phenomena which weaken the municipal functions;</i></p>	<p>LDP</p>	<p>0-5 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No objective or objectives were indicated or they are not related to the identified problems. 1-4 points – Some/most objectives were indicated without specifying sufficiently (only partially) whether/to what extent they may contribute to solving specified problems (some of them are unjustified, inadequate or not related to the identified problems). 5 points – All the indicated objectives may solve the identified problems (they are related, justified and feasible)/ are adequate for them.</p>	

<p>- the building of the development objectives on the endogenous potentials (resources of the units of the self-government and of partners and local products) and potentially exogenous potentials;</p> <p>- the objectives implemented in the cooperation with key local, regional and national partners (according to the specifics of the LDP).</p>				
<p><u>I.5. Description of planned activities</u></p>				
<p>To be assessed:</p> <p>a) the degree of linkage with problems and potentials resulting from the diagnosis/analysis; the justification, rationality and adequacy of the activities for the identified problems and their impact on the implementation of the objectives;</p> <p>- the extent to which the LDP/the activities make use of all available potentials/local resources possessed by the town and possibly by the partners;</p>	<p>LDP</p>	<p>0-15 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No linkage between the planned activities (neither the basic nor supplementary ones) with the identified problems/potentials or project objectives was proved (or the activities are completely unjustified/inadequate/irrational in terms of the identified problems and objectives).</p> <p>1-5 points – only a small part of the planned activities (basic and/or supplementary) is justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and may significantly contribute to solving them. A small part of activities is adequate for the assumed objectives. As a rule, the use of the potentials/strengths of the town during the performance of the activities is missing.</p> <p>6-10 points – a large part of the planned activities</p>	

<p>- the assessment of the aforementioned matters both for basic activities (implemented under the project) and supplementary activities (implemented outside of the project).</p>		<p>(basic and supplementary) is justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and may significantly contribute to solving them. Part of the activities are adequate for the assumed objectives of the project. It was proposed to use the potentials/strengths of the town during the performance of the activities to a smaller extent.</p> <p>10 points or more may be admitted to concepts where there is a strong correlation between basic activities and key aspects of urban development problems</p> <p>11-14 points – the majority of the planned (basic and supplementary) activities are justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and they will significantly contribute to solving them. The majority of the activities are adequate for the assumed objectives of the project. It was proposed to use all/the majority of the potentials/strengths of the town during the performance of the activities.</p> <p>15 points – All the planned activities (basic and supplementary) are justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and they will significantly contribute to solving them. All the activities are adequate for the assumed objectives of the project. It was proposed to use all the potentials/strengths of the town during the performance of the activities.</p>	
<p>To be assessed:</p>		<p>0 point – The planned activities are incomplete (lack</p>	

<p><i>b) completeness and accuracy (feasibility) of the activities, logic of intervention (causal relationship and their prioritisation/sequence of implementation of the activities), consistency (internal and external), integration, mutual linkages/ synergy/ complementarity of the activities;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the vertical consistency and logical linkage (problems, potentials, vision, objectives, activities) of the LDP;</i> - <i>the horizontal consistency and degree of integration of different scenarios of activities around the objectives of the LDP;</i> - <i>the assessment of the aforementioned issues for both the basic activities (implemented under the project) and supplementary activities (implemented outside of the project).</i> 	<p>LDP</p>	<p>0-15 points/</p>	<p>of important elements or activities in terms of the problems/objectives of the project) or incorrect (unfeasible in legal, methodological, other terms) as a rule. The specification of the planned intervention is not logical (there is no causal relationship, correct prioritization/sequence of activities, conceptual chaos). There is no internal and external consistency (between activities; no integration): one dimension/one topic of the activities, no complementarity and synergies of the activities. At least one out of three obligatory dimensions is missing (0 point in this case, although other premises of this sub-criterion are fulfilled).</p> <p>1-5 points – Part of the planned activities may be deemed incomplete (lack of important elements or activities in terms of the problems/objectives of the project) or incorrect (unfeasible in legal, methodological, other terms). The specification of the planned intervention is clearly not logical (there is no causal relationship, correct prioritization/sequence of activities, conceptual chaos). There is partially an internal and external inconsistency (between activities and no integration): one dimension/one topic of the activities dominate, low degree of complementarity and synergies of the activities. All three obligatory dimensions were included.</p> <p>6-10 points – Individual activities, in particular the basic ones, may be deemed incomplete (lack of important elements or activities in terms of the</p>	
---	-------------------	----------------------------	---	--

		<p>problems/objectives of the project) or the correctness raises doubts (they may be unfeasible in legal, methodological, other terms). The specification of the planned intervention is logical for most of the activities (mainly the basic ones) (a causal relationship was outlined to a large extent, correct prioritization/sequence of activities). There is a small internal or external inconsistency (between activities and no complete integration): multi-dimension/multi-topics of the activities dominate, medium degree of complementarity/integration and synergies of the activities.</p> <p>All three obligatory dimensions and at least one facultative dimension were included.</p> <p>11-14 points – Individual activities, in particular the supplementary ones, may be deemed incomplete (lack of important elements or activities in terms of the problems/objectives of the project) or the correctness raises doubts (may be unfeasible in legal, methodological, other terms). The specification of the planned intervention is logical for most of the activities (both the basic and supplementary ones) (a causal relationship was outlined for the majority of cases, correct prioritization/sequence of activities). There is a small internal or external inconsistency in very few cases and only for supplementary activities (between activities and no complete integration): multidimensional/multitopical activities dominate, high degree of complementarity/integration and synergies of the activities.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>All three obligatory dimensions and at least two facultative dimensions were included.</p> <p>15 points – All activities are complete and correct (feasible). The specification of the planned intervention is completely logical for the concept (a causal relationship was outlined, correct prioritization/sequence of activities), including the internal and external consistency (between the activities) and complete integration/complementarity of the activities. The synergies/mutual strengthening of the activities are complete and unquestionable. All three obligatory dimensions and at least two facultative dimensions were included.</p>	
<p><u>I.6. Quality of the process of public participation - Local Development Plan</u></p> <p><i>The assessment covers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the method and correctness of the selection of group of stakeholders relevant to preparation and implementation of the LDP; - adequacy and effectiveness of the participatory tools which were used in the process of the LDP development in order to inform, consult and include (co-decision) representatives of a local community; - the scope, type, intensity and 	LDP	<p>0-10 points/</p> <p>0 point – The involvement of the local community in preparatory work and project activities was not planned.</p> <p>1-5 points – It was assumed less precisely that one or few interested groups of stakeholders and/or their representatives will participate in the preparation and implementation of project activities (the catalogue of groups of the local community/stakeholders important for the project activities is very limited). Different forms and techniques for involving the community in the preparation of the project activities were used, but they mostly involve a passive process of informing and consulting (rather than the factual involvement in the decision-making processes). Different forms and techniques for involving the community in the performance of the project activities were assumed,</p>	<p>NOTE: In case 0 point is awarded according to this sub-criterion, the CPP will not be recommended for funding.</p>	

<p><i>diversity of the participatory tools which are planned to be used during the project implementation in order to inform, consult and actually include (co-decision) different representatives of a local community;</i></p> <p><i>-the assessment method of submitted proposals and the method for using the results of participation;</i></p> <p><i>-the institutionalization of the aforementioned solutions to make them useful in the future for the implementation of the LDP, monitoring evaluation and the actualisation of the LDP.</i></p>		<p>but they mostly involve a passive process of informing and consulting (rather than the factual involvement in the decision-making processes). They do not guarantee information about project activities for the local community or its involvement in the works. The scope, frequency, nature and scope of the planned consultations are insufficient, if compared with the assumed objectives of the project. No method for using the results of the public consultations was presented. The aforementioned solutions have not been institutionalised in order to be used in the future for the LDP implementation, monitoring evaluation and updating.</p> <p>6-9 points – It was ensured that many/ majority of the potentially interested groups of stakeholders and/or their representatives will participate in the preparation and implementation of project activities. Different forms and techniques for involving the community in the preparation of the project activities were used and they mostly consist in a passive process of informing, consulting and to large extent the factual involvement of these groups or their representatives in the decision-making processes. Different forms and techniques for involving the community in the performance of the project activities were assumed and they mostly consist in the factual involvement in the decision-making processes. They make it highly probable that the local community will not be only informed, but also included in the project works. The</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>scope, frequency, nature and scope of the planned consultations are sufficient, if compared with the assumed objectives of the project. The method for using the results of the public consultations was presented more or less generally.</p> <p>The aforementioned solutions were partially institutionalised – partially they can be used in the future for the LDP implementation, monitoring evaluation and updating.</p> <p>10 points – Large spectrum of the local community (representing the wide catalogue of potential stakeholders or in executional cases of their representatives) in the preparation and implementation of project activities was guaranteed. The most advanced, inclusive tools for involving the local community, guaranteeing its co-deciding, were proposed. The scope, frequency, nature and scope of activities in this respect are sufficient, if compared with the assumed objectives of the project. The method for using the results of the public consultations was presented in detail. The aforementioned solutions were institutionalised – they can be used in the future for the LDP implementation, monitoring evaluation and updating.</p>	
<p><u>1.7. Implementation schedule of the Local Development Plan</u></p> <p>- The assessment covers the reality</p>	LDP	<p>0-5 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No schedule of the performance of individual stages or activities was presented or it is unrealistic/unfeasible.</p> <p>1-4 points – The presented schedule of the</p>	

<p><i>and feasibility of the planned activities in time (both basic and supplementary activities, implemented both under, in parallel to the project and after the completion of the project, should be considered).</i></p> <p><i>Package of the implementation of the LDP with key yearly management procedures, i.e. the preparation of the budget, the preparation of the multiannual investment programme and the multiannual financial plan, other operational programmes.</i></p>			<p>performance of individual stages and (basic and supplementary) activities contains less or more unrealistic deadlines. It is partially unfeasible in the assumed time horizon. It has been linked to the key management procedures to a greater or lesser extent.</p> <p>5 points – The presented schedule of the performance of individual stages and activities is realistic and feasible. It has been linked to the key management procedures.</p>	
<p><u>1.8. Financial analysis of the Local Development Plan</u></p>				
<p><i>To be assessed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the financial analysis to recognize potential sources of financing activities which exceed the project and their estimated value;</i> - <i>the analysis of the level of involving of external sources of financing, in particular own sources of local stakeholders;</i> 	<p>LDP</p>	<p>0-15 points/</p>	<p>0-1 point – No analysis was performed on the possibilities to finance activities exceeding the project scope (time, financial and substantive framework) or the analysis is so general that it does not enable to confirm chances to finance the aforementioned activities.</p> <p>2-7 points – The financial analysis is very general and generally reveals very doubtful potential sources of financing (e.g. competition, aid funds, grants). More promising and reliable sources of financing were identified in some individual cases. In general,</p>	

<p>- the analysis of the financial capacity of the applicant (current and capital expenditures);</p> <p>- the extent to which the performed financial analysis guarantees that the aforementioned planned activities will be performed outside of the project;</p> <p>-the extent to which the LDP/AP analysis enables to predict the future changes of the current and capital expenditures and incomes in the budget of the town budget, i.e. if it was proved, e.g. by attaching a print-out from the publically available module "MFP Simulations" in BeSTi@ of the Ministry of Finance or from any other analytical tool, that the implementation of the proposed project (LDP/AP) would not undermine the balance in the current part of the budget in the upcoming years (Articles 242 and 243 of the Public Finance Act)?</p>			<p>the analysis does not however guarantee that the activities will be performed.</p> <p>8-14 points – The financial analysis is relatively general, but it contains more or less details (both in the form of calculations and descriptions), while making it really possible that the activities are very probable to be financed to a larger or smaller extent. Part of certain and explicit instruments/sources of financing were indicated. The analysis partially guarantees that the activities will be performed. Further, the financial situation of the municipality was analysed diligently and it does not enable the municipality to support the activities significantly (the last element for 14 points).</p> <p>15 points – The financial analysis is very accurate and detailed (both in the form of calculations and descriptions) and it guarantees that the respective activities will be financed. Different certain and explicit instruments/sources of financing were indicated, one of the sources involved the own sources of the municipality, without any detriment to its functioning (specified in figures).</p>	
<p><u>I.9. Risk analysis and risk management</u> - How accurately was the risk analysis</p>	LDP	0-5	<p>0 point – No risk analysis was prepared.</p> <p>1-4 points – The presented risk analysis is not completely accurate or comprehensive; is incomplete</p>	

<p><i>prepared and does the risk management structure guarantee that the activities in crisis situations will be correct for the implementation of the Plan?</i></p> <p><i>- to what extent does the risk analysis consider the threats analysed in the diagnosis, resulting from adverse trends in the demographic, socio-economic situation and environmental changes?</i></p> <p><i>- to what extent does the risk analysis consider the possibilities and consequences of gaining local stakeholders for the implementation of the LDP?</i></p>		<p>points/</p>	<p>(does not define important risks, there are no remedial tools), it contains many general statements which do not enable to identify the significance of the risk for the implementation of the plan; the scale and impact of the risk were assessed partially incorrectly; not all remedial activities are sufficient/adequate for the risks.</p> <p>5 points – The risk analysis is accurate, complete, rational and correctly defines the most important risks, their scale of impact and remedial tools.</p>	
<p><u>I.10. Implementation system of the Local Development Plan and procedure of its modification</u></p> <p>To be assessed:</p> <p><i>- How effective is the implementation system of the Plan and does it guarantee its implementation?</i></p> <p><i>- The degree of linkage of the implementation of the LDP with key yearly management procedures, i.e. the preparation of the budget, the preparation of the multiannual</i></p>	<p>LDP</p>	<p>0-5 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No implementation system, including the modification of the LDP, was proposed.</p> <p>1-4 points – The proposed system is more or less general; there are doubts as to its effectiveness and flexibility (including the definite thresholds) and it does not fully guarantee that the Plan will be implemented effectively. The LDP implementation is linked with the key management procedures to a lesser or greater extent. One could say the LDP is partially used to develop permanent, rolling, mid-term and integrated system of the town development management.</p> <p>5 points – The system is detailed, accurate, contains</p>	

<p><i>investment programme and the multiannual financial plan, the preparation of yearly reports on the condition of the town, yearly public consultations, and the monitoring of the performed programmes;</i></p> <p><i>-The institutionalization of the solutions and the use of the LDP for institutionalizing and building a rolling medium-term integrated system for managing the development of the town.</i></p>			<p>all the necessary elements and the admissible flexibility of interventions and changes, adjustment activities and other mechanisms which guarantee that the Plan will be implemented effectively. The LDP implementation is linked with the key management procedures. The LDP will be used to develop permanent, rolling, mid-term and integrated system of the town development management.</p>	
<p><u>I.11. System for monitoring progress and evaluation effects of the project</u></p> <p>a) <u>Monitoring (0 – 6 points)</u></p> <p><i>- To what extent does the monitoring system enable an accurate and correct assessment of progress in the implementation of the project?</i></p> <p><i>- To what extent does the planned monitoring system consider all dimensions of monitoring (results, outputs, impacts)?</i></p> <p><i>- Do the selected facultative monitoring indicators supplement the monitoring based on obligatory</i></p>	<p>LDP</p>	<p>0-10 points/</p>	<p>0 point - the monitoring or evaluation system was not presented or it contains significant defects in terms of the obligatory indicators.</p> <p>1-4 points – The monitoring system was presented to a medium extent, based on the all dimensions of monitoring and obligatory indicators concerning one or several thematic dimensions. Many base or target values of the indicators may raise doubts as to their feasibility and credibility. In general, the proposed monitoring system does not enable an accurate and correct assessment of progress in the implementation of the project. The monitoring system which has been developed is not institutionalised (for permanent use). The LDP determines the plan of evaluation of project outcomes in less detailed way. It may raise doubts if the Plan is able to provide an</p>	<p>NOTE: The CPP recommended for funding will have to contain all obligatory indicators adequate for the specifics/topic of the project (before the project contract is signed at the latest) according to the logframe delivered by the Programme Operator.</p>

<p><i>indicators sufficiently so that the assessment of the performance of individual activities/dimensions is possible and credible?</i></p> <p><i>- Do the indicated base and target values of the indicators raise no doubts as to their feasibility and credibility?</i></p> <p><i>- What is the institutionalisation level of the monitoring system?</i></p> <p><i>b) Evaluation (0-4 points)</i></p> <p><i>- To what extent does the monitoring system result in transparent mechanism of the LDP effects evaluation?</i></p> <p><i>- To what extent the mechanism of the LDP evaluation used for update of the town development policies is institutionalised?</i></p>			<p>accurate and objective assessment of project outcomes. The proposed system is suited for continuous revision and updating of the town development policies to a small extent.</p> <p>5-9 points – The monitoring system implementing completely all the monitoring dimensions and obligatory indicators was presented, adequately for each activity (5 points). The system is also based on facultative indicators to a large extent. Some of the specified base or target values may raise doubts as to their feasibility and credibility. The proposed monitoring system enables an accurate and correct assessment of progress in the implementation of the project to a large extent. The monitoring system which has been developed may be deemed to be institutionalised to a large extent (for permanent use). The LDP determines the plan of evaluation of project outcomes in more detailed way, however it may raise doubts as to the Plan is able to provide an accurate and objective assessment of project outcomes. The proposed system is suited for continuous revision and updating of the town development policies to a large extent.</p> <p>10 points – The monitoring system is complete, comprehensive and accurate. The system contains all the monitoring dimensions and all the obligatory indicators and the majority of the facultative indicators, adequately for the project. The base and target values of the indicators do not raise any</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

			<p>doubts. The monitoring system which has been developed may be deemed to be institutionalised (for permanent use).</p> <p>The LDP contains comprehensive description of the evaluation process which guarantees an accurate and objective assessment (including the conclusions and recommendations) of factual outcomes of the projects. The proposed system is suited for continuous revision and updating of the town development policies.</p>	
II. Quality of the concept for supporting/developing the local administration – (Institutional) Action Plan		Max. 50 points	CPP might be recommended for funding in case of obtaining at least 60% for the criterion II	
<p><u>II.1. Diagnosis of deficits and problems, including the operational characteristics of the local administration</u></p> <p><i>To be assessed:</i></p> <p>- the quality of the presented description of the town, i.e. its consistency, transparency, accuracy, i.e. its basing on the quantitative and qualitative data in the possession of the town and of external stakeholders; the detailed description of the operating standards of the</p>	AP	0-10 points/	<p>0 point – No diagnosis was performed or the current condition of the functioning of the local administration was not described.</p> <p>1-4 points – A general diagnosis of problems was presented, including description of the current condition (not in terms of all institutional aspects (competence level, operating standards, cooperation with external stakeholders), but they were not performed or justified sufficiently in detail and accurately. By specifying the development problems/challenges, the quantitative data in the possession of the town or of external stakeholders were not referred to at all or to a minor extent and/or qualitative data (including the studies on the local communities) were not referred to at all or their</p>	

<p>administration, the level of various (substantive and administrative) competences and the level of cooperation of the administration with external stakeholders;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the level of detail, credibility and accuracy of the performed diagnosis, including its basing on the quantitative and qualitative data in the possession of the town or of other public entities (including on the Local Development Monitor as an additional source of information about the situation of the applicant), and on the surveys conducted in the local community - among stakeholders; - the proof for the significance of the identified problems for the lower development pace of the town or for the poorer functioning of the local administration; - the level of institutional and professional potential of the town which is essential for programming and implementation of the development policies, including an 			<p>results were to a large extent inadequate to identified problems. No LDM-tool was referred to or it was used only declaratively. The significance of most problems for the lower development pace of the town or for the poorer functioning of the local administration was proved to a small extent.</p> <p>5 - 9 points – An insufficiently comprehensive diagnosis of problems was performed and the current condition was presented with no sufficient details - some or all three institutional aspects were discussed to a larger or smaller extent (competence level, operating standards, cooperation with external stakeholders), which was not justified sufficiently accurately. By specifying problems/challenges, the quantitative data in the possession of the town or external stakeholders were referred to to a larger or smaller extent. The qualitative data (including the studies on the local communities) were referred to to a larger or smaller extent and their results are mostly adequate to the identified problems. An LDM-tool was used as an additional source of information about the problem situation of the applicant. The significance of some problems for the lower development pace of the town or for the poorer functioning of the local administration was not proved.</p> <p>10 points – A reliable and comprehensive diagnosis of the current stages and of problems was performed, which was justified sufficiently, i.e. by specifying the</p>	
---	--	--	--	--

<p><i>assessment of its impact on the town development potential.</i></p>			<p>problems/challenges, the adequate quantitative and qualitative data (including the studies on the local community) in the possession of the town or external stakeholders were referred to. Large part of stakeholders was included. An LDM-tool was used as an additional source of information about the problem situation of the applicant, if compared with the comparable group of cities. The diagnosis contains a detailed context description of the problems (their scale, significance, causes, effects), which confirms their huge significance in terms of a lower development pace of the town or of the poorer functioning of the local administration.</p>	
<p><u>II.2. Objectives and needs of the Action Plan</u></p> <p>- <i>The assessment covers the justification and feasibility and adequacy of the objectives and needs, if compared with the identified problems, including institutional dimension as well as developmental;</i></p> <p>- <i>the level of growth-oriented institutional potencial of the self-government, inclusion of different entities and co-management..</i></p>	<p>AP</p>	<p>0-5 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No objective or objectives were indicated or they are not related to the identified problems</p> <p>1-4 points – The indicated objectives are factual growth-oriented toward the institutional potential insufficiently. It has not been proven whether/to what extent they may contribute to solving the specified problems (some of them are unjustified, inadequate or not related to the identified problems). The needs corresponding to the problem-based diagnosis were not indicated or the presented needs are not completely adequate for the diagnosis.</p> <p>5 points – A correct and sufficiently detailed and factual growth-oriented toward institutional potential objective or objectives were indicated; it was proven that they may solve the identified problems (they are related, justified and feasible)/are adequate for them.</p>	

			The presented needs are completely adequate for the diagnosis.	
<p><u>II.3. Description of planned activities</u></p> <p><i>To be assessed:</i></p> <p>a) <i>the justification, rationality and adequacy of the activities for the identified problems and their impact on the implementation of the objectives, i.e.:</i></p> <p>- <i>To what extent does the Plan assume that the level of competences of the employees and services provided by the self-government will be improved? Were any tools and methods for improving the qualifications and knowledge of the employees of the town hall and its subordinated entities/institutions indicated?</i></p> <p>- <i>To what extent does the Plan assume that the operating standard of the town hall/its subordinated entities will be enhanced (including the enhanced openness and transparency)?</i></p> <p>- <i>To what extent does the Plan</i></p>	<p>AP</p>	<p>0-15 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No linkage between the planned activities with the identified problems or objectives was proved (or the activities are completely unjustified/inadequate/irrational in terms of the identified problems and objectives).</p> <p>1-5 points – A small part of the planned activities are justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and they may significantly contribute to solving them. Part of the project activities in this dimension may contribute to enhanced of the developmental activities implemented under the LDP. Part of the project activities are adequate for the assumed objectives.</p> <p>6-10 points – A large part of the planned activities are justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and they may significantly contribute to solving them. A large part of activities in this dimension may contribute to enhanced the development activities of the town performed under the LDP.</p> <p>11-14 points – The majority of the planned activities are justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and they will significantly contribute to solving them. The majority of activities in this dimension will contribute to enhanced the development activities of the town performed under</p>	

<p><i>foresees effective methods of including inhabitants in the processes of: planning, decision-making and co-management of municipality?</i></p> <p><i>- To what extent does the Plan assume the adjustment of the activities of the local administration to the needs of the citizens?</i></p> <p><i>- To what extent does the aforementioned activities aimed to increase of the institutional potential of the self-government enhance the implementation of activities under the LDP?</i></p>			<p>the LDP. The majority of the activities are adequate for the assumed objectives.</p> <p>15 points – All the planned activities are justified, reasonable and adequate for the identified problems and they will significantly contribute to solving them. The activities in this dimension will contribute to enhanced development activities of the town performed under the LDP. The activities are adequate for the assumed objectives.</p>	
<p>b) Implementation schedule of the Action Plan</p> <p><i>- The assessment covers the reality and feasibility of the planned activities in time.</i></p>	AP	0-5 points/	<p>0 point – No schedule of the performance of activities was presented or it is unrealistic/unfeasible.</p> <p>1-4 points – A schedule of the performance of activities was presented. It is partially unfeasible in the assumed time horizon.</p> <p>5 points – The presented schedule of the performance of individual stages and activities is realistic and feasible.</p>	
<p><u>II.4. Quality of the process of public participation - Action Plan</u></p> <p><i>The assessment covers:</i></p>		0-5 points/	<p>0 point – The involvement of the local community in the preparatory work and project activities was not planned.</p> <p>1- 4 points – It was assumed more or less precisely that one or several interested groups of stakeholders</p>	<p>NOTE: In case 0 point is awarded according to this sub-criterion, the CPP will not be recommended for funding.</p>

<p><i>- the method and the accuracy of the stakeholders group selection relevant for the preparation and implementation of the AP;</i></p> <p><i>- the adequacy and effectiveness of the participatory tools used in the process of preparation of the AP in order to inform, consult and involve (co-decision) representatives of the local community;</i></p> <p><i>- the scope, type, intensity and diversity of the participatory tools planned to use in the process of AP implementation in order to inform, consult and factually involve (co-decision) different representatives of the local community;</i></p> <p><i>-the method of the assessment of the submitted proposals and the method for using the results;</i></p> <p><i>-the method of the institutionalisation of the aforementioned solutions to be used in the AP implementation and the monitoring of evaluation and updating of the AP.</i></p>	AP	<p>will participate in the preparation and implementation of project activities (the catalogue of groups of the local community/stakeholders important for the project activities is incomplete). Different forms and techniques for involving the community in the preparation of the project activities were used, but they involve a passive process of informing and consulting and to smaller or larger extent the factual involvement of these groups or their representatives in the decision-making processes. Different forms and techniques for involving the community in the performance of the project activities were assumed, but they partially involve a passive process of informing and consulting and to smaller or larger extent the factual involvement in the decision-making processes. They do not guarantee information about project activities for the local community or its full involvement in the works. The scope, frequency, nature and range of the planned consultations are insufficient, if compared with the assumed objectives of the project. The method for using the results of the public consultations was presented more or less generally. The above solutions were partially institutionalised – in the future they partially might be used in the AP implementation and monitoring of evaluation and updating of the AP.</p> <p>5 points – Large spectrum of the local community in the preparation and implementation of project activities was guaranteed (representing the wide</p>	
--	-----------	--	--

			<p>catalogue of potential stakeholders or in exceptional cases their representatives). The most advanced, inclusive tools for involving the local community, guaranteeing informing, consulting and co-deciding, were proposed. The scope, frequency, nature and range of the activities in this respect are sufficient, if compared with the assumed objectives of the project. The method for using the results of the public consultations was presented in detail.</p> <p>It is beyond any doubt that the Plan was prepared after comprehensive public consultations with the residents/other users of the town.</p> <p>The above solutions were institutionalised - in the future they partially might be used in the AP implementation and monitoring of evaluation and updating of the AP.</p>	
<p><u>II.5. Risk analysis and risk management</u></p> <p><i>- How accurately was the risk analysis prepared and does the management structure guarantee that the activities in crisis situations will be correct for the implementation of the Plan?</i></p>	<p>AP</p>	<p>0-3 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No risk analysis was prepared.</p> <p>1- 2 points – The presented risk analysis is not completely accurate or comprehensive; is incomplete (does not define important risks, there are no remedial tools), contains many general statements which do not enable to identify the significance of the risk for the implementation of the plan; the scale and impact of the risk were assessed partially incorrectly; not all remedial activities are sufficient/adequate for the risks.</p> <p>3 points – The risk analysis is accurate, complete, rational and correctly defines the most important risks, their scale of impact and remedial tools.</p>	

<p><u>II.6. Implementation system of the Action Plan and procedure of its modification</u></p> <p>- How effective is the implementation system of the Plan and does it guarantee its implementation?</p> <p><i>The institutionalisation and use of the AP for institutionalisation and building permanent, rolling, mid-term and integrated institutional system are subject to the assessment.</i></p>	<p>AP</p>	<p>0-2 points/</p>	<p>0 point – No implementation system, including the modification of the AP, was proposed.</p> <p>1 point – The proposed system is more or less general; there are doubts as to its effectiveness, flexibility (including the definite thresholds) and it does not fully guarantee that the Plan will be implemented effectively. The AP would not be able to be used to build permanent, rolling, mid-term and integrated institutional system.</p> <p>2 points – The system is detailed, accurate, contains all the necessary elements and the admissible flexibility of interventions and changes, adjustment activities and other mechanisms which guarantee that the Plan will be implemented effectively. The AP will be used to build permanent, rolling, mid-term and integrated institutional system.</p>	
<p><u>II.7. System for monitoring progress and evaluation of the project outcomes</u></p> <p>a) <u>Monitoring (up to 3 points):</u></p> <p>- To what extent does the monitoring system enable an accurate and correct assessment of progress in the implementation of the AP?</p> <p>- to what extent does the monitoring system consider all monitoring dimensions (outcomes, outputs, impact)?</p>	<p>AP</p>	<p>0-5 points/</p>	<p>0 point - The monitoring system or the evaluation system were not presented.</p> <p>1-2 points – The monitoring system was presented to a medium extent, based on the obligatory indicators. Many base or target values of the indicators may raise doubts as to their feasibility and credibility. In general, the proposed monitoring system does not enable an accurate and correct assessment of progress in the implementation of the AP.</p> <p>The monitoring system which has been designed is not institutionalised (for permanent use). The AP indicates the plan for the project outcomes evaluation</p>	<p>NOTE: The CPP recommended for funding will have to contain all obligatory indicators adequate for the specifics/topic of the project (before the project contract is signed at the latest) according to the logframe delivered by the Programme Operator.</p>

<p>- Do the selected facultative monitoring indicators supplement the monitoring based on obligatory indicators sufficiently so that the assessment of the performance of individual activities is possible and credible?</p> <p>- Do the indicated base and target values of the indicators raise no doubts as to their feasibility and credibility?</p> <p>- What is the institutionalisation level of the monitoring system ?</p> <p>b) <u>Evaluation (up to 2 points):</u></p> <p>-to what extent does the monitoring system result in the transparent mechanism of the outcomes evaluation of the AP?</p> <p>-to what extent is the mechanism of the AP evaluation institutionalised as to update the self-government policy of the institutional development?</p>			<p>in less detail. The plan may raise doubts as to guarantee the accuracy and objective assessment of the project outcomes. To a small extent, the proposed system is suited to permanent revision and updating of the self-government policy of the institutional development</p> <p>3-4 points – The monitoring system implementing completely all the obligatory indicators was presented, adequately for each activity . The system is also based on facultative indicators to a large extent. Some of the specified base or target values may raise doubts as to their feasibility and credibility. The proposed monitoring system enables an accurate and correct assessment of progress in the implementation of the AP to a large extent.</p> <p>The monitoring system which has been designed can be considered institutionalised (for permanent use) to a large extent. The AP indicates the plan for the project outcomes evaluation in more detail, however it may raise doubts as to guarantee the accuracy and objective assessment of the project outcomes. To a large extent, the proposed system is suited to permanent revision and updating of the self-government policy of the institutional development</p> <p>5 points – The monitoring system is complete, comprehensive and accurate. The system contains all the obligatory indicators and the majority of the facultative indicators, adequately for the AP. The base and target values of the indicators do not raise</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

			any doubts. The monitoring system which has been designed can be considered as institutionalised (for permanent use). The AP contains a comprehensive description of the process evaluation which guarantees an accurate and objective assessment (including the conclusions and recommendations) of its factual outcomes. The proposed system is suited to permanent revision and updating of the self-government policy of the institutional development.	
III. <u>Budget and cost effectiveness of the project</u>		Max. 30 points		
<p><i>The assessment should cover the accuracy, level of detail and rationality of the financial planning for project activities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was the budget drawn up in a transparent and accurate way? Are the unit rates for calculating costs based on market realities? Do the estimates of the labour and capital intensity of individual tasks deviate from the existing market standards significantly? - Are all cost items justified and necessary? - Are the management costs justified in the context of the specifics and implementation period of the project? 	<p>III of the FPP</p> <p>Detailed project budget</p>	0- 20 points/	<p>0 points – attached budget provides so draft, vague and general information that one cannot confirm whether it refers to the project under „Local Development” Programme</p> <p>1 - 6 points – budget has been prepared at very general level. As a rule, one cannot say whether presented costs are reasonable and competitive. Budget contains numerous cost categories that are unjustified/ improper/ significantly over- or underestimated. Management costs are unproportionate to the project implementation costs and unjustified as regards specifics of the project.</p> <p>7 – 13 points – budget has been prepared at general level. Vast portion of presented costs is unreasonable and non-competitive. Budget contains many cost categories that are unjustified/ improper/ over- or underestimated; or these costs constitute significant</p>	

			<p>part of total project budget. Management costs are unproportionate to the project implementation costs.</p> <p>14 – 19 points – as a rule, budget has been prepared in detailed and thorough manner. Small number of presented costs is unreasonable or non-competitive. Budget contains few cost categories that are unjustified/ improper/ over- or underestimated; or these costs constitute minor part of total project budget. Management costs are proportionate to the project implementation costs and its specifics.</p> <p>20 points - budget has been prepared in detailed and thorough manner. All presented costs are reasonable and competitive. Budget does not contain unjustified or improper costs. Management costs are proportionate to the project implementation costs and its specifics or they has not been proposed at all.</p>	
<p>- To what extent was the impossibility to generate net revenues and the purpose of the generated economic benefits considered exclusively for covering exploitation costs of the revenue-generating infrastructure during the preparation of the project budget?²</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>0-10 points/</p>	<p>0 point – the project contains activities which generate significant net revenues, but the funding was not reduced thereby (it was not proved in an unequivocal manner that the total revenues will be used for covering the exploitation costs of the infrastructure which generates the revenues).</p> <p>1- 4 points – the project contains several activities which generate net revenues, but the funding was not reduced thereby at all or incorrectly (it was not proved</p>	<p>NOTE: Should the assessor establish that net revenues are generated, which were not identified by the applicant, the expert recommends the reduction of funding. Based on this recommendation the Project Selection Committee together with the Programme Operator perform calculations and propose lower value of funding appropriately (it concerns</p>

² In case net revenues are generated, including the savings from the performance of specific activities (in case they cannot be used for covering the exploitation costs), the value of funding should be reduced by the estimated net revenues according to the methodology delivered by the Programme Operator.

			<p>in an unequivocal manner that the total revenues will be used for covering the exploitation costs of the infrastructure which generates the revenues).</p> <p>5-9 points – the project contains an activity or activities which generate insignificant net revenues, but the net revenues were not reduced thereby at all or by an excessively low amount. It was not proved in an unequivocal manner that the total revenues will be used for covering the exploitation costs of the infrastructure which generates the revenues.</p> <p>10 points – The project does not generate net revenues at all or the requested funding was reduced thereby appropriately.</p>	the CPP to be granted a funding).
- Do the investment expenditures exceed 60% of the eligible project costs ³ ?		YES/NO		NOTE: in case the answer is YES expert recommendation is necessary and it should involve decrease in the level of project investment expenditures.
IV. Information and promotional activities		Max. 5 points		
- The assessment covers the consistency with the principles, including the minimum tools specified in <i>the Information and Communication Requirements</i> .	II.4 CPP	0-5 points/	<p>0 point – No information and promotional activities were proposed or they are inconsistent with <i>the Information and Communication Requirements</i>.</p> <p>1-4 points – The activities are partially consistent</p>	

³ Should it be established that the threshold is exceeded, the Assessors recommend a method for reducing the costs, which should ultimately be approved by the Project Selection Committee.

			<p>with <i>the Requirements</i>/are considered at certain stages of the implementation of the project/are partially adequate, effective and attractive for the project/its target groups.</p> <p>5 points – The activities involve the use of a larger set of additional promotional tools, excluding those specified in <i>the Requirements</i>; they are present during the implementation of the entire project and after its completion, are effective and adequate for the target groups.</p>	
V. Project management in the context of the implementation of the Development Plan/ Action Plan		Max. 10 points		
<p><i>To be assessed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent do the described experience of the team, organizational structure of the project team, duties of individual employees, information flow guarantee the correct implementation of the project/ plans? (0-3 points) - To what extent does the description of the activities to be performed under the management duties and the decision-making process guarantee that the plans/project will be managed and implemented correctly? (0-4 points) 	<p>II.5 CPP</p>	<p>0-10 points/</p>	<p>Each of the aspect is assessed independently in various ranges, according to the description of this sub-criterion. The total score in the ranges is the sum of scores according to the sub-criterion.</p>	

<p>- To what extent will the effective cooperation with an external expert guaranteed (to what extent is that guaranteed by the vision of the applicant as to its role, cooperation method), which ensures the correct and effective implementation of the project/plans? (0-3 points)</p>				
<p>VI. Potential of the national partnership</p>		<p>Max. 10 points</p>		
<p>To be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the implementation of the project planned under the formula of a national partnership? - What is the added value from the cooperation of various national partners under the project? - Does the proposed composition of the partnership (their division of duties, project functions, participation in the project budget) trigger important benefits and synergies which would not come into existence in case of the lack of cooperation, both during the implementation of the project and under the planned intervention in 	<p>II.6 CPP</p>	<p>0-10 points/</p>	<p>0-1 point – No partnership is planned (0 score) or no added value from the partnership cooperation was identified (1 score).</p> <p>2-5 points – The added value (benefits, synergies) from the cooperation of partners is diversified. The participation of some partners was sufficiently justified as necessary in terms of the objectives of the project/the implementation of the Plans. The partners come from one sector (either from different units of the self-government or different sectors). There are no representatives of entities/institutions which are important in terms of the planned activities. The partnership will function exclusively during the implementation of the project.</p> <p>6-9 points - The added value (benefits, synergies) from the cooperation of partners is high. The</p>	

<p><i>future?</i></p> <p>- <i>What is the value of the partnership for the implementation of the objectives and activities of the Local Development Plan?</i></p>			<p>participation of the majority of partners was sufficiently justified as necessary in terms of the objectives of the project/the implementation of the Plans. The partners come from different units of the self-government or different sectors. There is no representative of the entity/institution which is important in terms of the planned activities. The partnership functions during the preparation and implementation of the project.</p> <p>10 points - The added value from the cooperation of partners was proved both during the preparation, implementation of the project and in future. The partnership is highly diversified (both the self-government and different sectors) and justified in terms of the planned activities and the implementation of the objectives of the project. No key entity is missing. The partnership is necessary to implement the Local Development Plan.</p>	
<p>VII. Planned effects and project sustainability</p>		<p>Max. 5 points</p>		
<p><i>To be assessed:</i></p> <p>- <i>How did the applicant assure that the effects of the project would be used to implement future projects? Was the method for using the effects of the</i></p>	<p>II.7 CPP</p>	<p>0-5 points/</p>	<p>Each of the aspect is assessed independently in various ranges, according to the description of this sub-criterion. The total score in the ranges is the sum of scores according to the sub-criterion.</p>	

<p><i>project correctly described/planned in the context of the established problems of the town? (0-3 points)</i></p> <p><i>- How credible and sufficient are the specified sources of financing the activities based on the effects of the project to continue the development of the effects of the project? (0-2 points)</i></p>				
<p>VIII. Dissemination of good practices (educational activities)</p>		<p>Max. 10 points</p>		
<p><i>To be assessed:</i></p> <p><i>- How much of the information on the methods and tools for disseminating own experiences and sharing the knowledge gained during the implementation of the project with other interested entities/residents was presented?</i></p> <p><i>- How effective are the proposed methods and tools and to what extent do they guarantee that the specified target groups will be reached out to?</i></p> <p><i>- To what extent were the target groups of the educational activities</i></p>	<p>II.8 CPP</p>	<p>0-10 points/</p>	<p>0 point – The respective matters were not referred to.</p> <p>1-5 points – The educational activities, i.e. the methods and tools for disseminating own experiences gained at one or multiple stages of the implementation of the project or exclusively after its completion, were presented in a general way. The group of potential interested recipients of the knowledge of the applicant/beneficiary was presented in a general way. As a rule, they are not (or it is impossible to establish) effective in terms of reaching out to the groups of recipients.</p> <p>6-9 points – The educational activities, i.e. the methods and tools for disseminating own experiences gained at the majority of stages of the implementation of the project, including after its completion, were</p>	<p>NOTE: In case 0 point is awarded according to this sub-criterion, the CPP will not be recommended for funding.</p>

<p><i>correctly defined in the context of the project activities and objectives?</i></p>			<p>presented. The group of potential interested recipients of the knowledge of the applicant/beneficiary was presented and justified in a general way. The majority of the activities are effective and may reach out to concrete groups of recipients.</p> <p>10 points – Different methods and tools for disseminating own experiences gained at all stages of the implementation of the project and after its completion were presented in a detailed way. The group of potential interested recipients of the knowledge of the applicant/beneficiary was presented and justified in a detailed way. There are no doubts as to that the aforementioned activities will allow to reach out to the groups of recipients effectively.</p>	
<p>IX. Accessibility grant up to PLN 100 000</p>				
<p><i>To be assessed:</i></p> <p>1) <i>Do the proposed activities related to the matter of accessibility (up to PLN 100,000.00) specified in point 8.4 letter b) of the Rules and Regulations of the Call for Proposals have a positive impact on the implementation</i></p>	<p>CPP</p>	<p>YES/NO</p>	<p>NO – The project does not consider the matter of accessibility; the three questions are answered “NO”.</p> <p>YES – The activities mentioned in the respective point of the CPP implement the rule of accessibility. They are consistent with the accessibility standards specified in the Programme Accessibility Plus 2018-2025. The activities are justified, rational and useful for the users of the town/the residents with disabilities or various physical or intellectual limitations (relevant sources were referred to, the assessment of the position of the residents/users of the town was</p>	<p>The applicant fills in this point of the CPP as long as it receives a negative or conditional assessment of this aspect at the stage of the project outline or of modifying/actualising the proposed activities related to the matter of accessibility (up to PLN 100,000.00), if compared with the information included in the recommendations of the experts who assess the project outline. If the applicant receives a negative assessment according to this sub-</p>

<p><i>of the rules of accessibility, in particular are they consistent with the accessibility standards specified in the Programme Accessibility Plus 2018-2025?⁴</i></p> <p>2) <i>Are the aforementioned activities justified and rational in terms of the needs of the residents/users of the town in terms of the accessibility?</i></p> <p>3) <i>Will the product or products of the activities be available for persons with disabilities, while creating a factual facilitation for them?</i></p>			<p>analysed).</p>	<p>criterion, the applicant will not have a chance to receive a grant for performing the activities. Point 8.4 b) of the Rules and Regulations of the Call for Proposals contains detailed information in this respect.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------	---

X. CRITERIA EXCLUDING FROM THE POSSIBILITY TO OBTAIN FUNDING⁵

<p>A. Budget: <i>The project budget contains funds (a reserve) for potential activities with the</i></p>	<p>Detailed project budget</p>	<p>YES/NO</p>	<p>NOTE: In case the answer is NO according to this sub-criterion, the CPP will not be recommended for funding.</p>	
---	--------------------------------	---------------	--	--

⁴ <https://www.miiir.gov.pl/strony/zadania/dlaczego-dostepnosc/>.

⁵ Apart from issues referred to in this criterion, the CPP cannot be recommended for funding in case of 0 points under criteria concerning public participation and dissemination of best practices.

<i>participation of the partnership entities from the Donor States.</i>				
<p>B. Accessibility dimension (in Development and Action Plans):</p> <p>Accessibility was considered in the Development Plan and Action Plan.</p> <p><i>In particular, the assessment covers the transparency and accuracy of the identification of the groups with special needs and whether the proposed activities strengthen equal opportunities of the groups to participate in the life of the town.</i></p>	Plans	YES/NO	<p>NO – The matter of accessibility was not considered in the project (basic and supplementary) activities under the Development and Action Plans.</p> <p>YES – The project activities specified in the Development and Action Plans implement the matter of accessibility. They are consistent with the accessibility standards specified in the Programme Accessibility Plus 2018-2025⁶. The respective activities are justified, rational and useful for the users of the town/the residents with disabilities or various physical or intellectual limitations (relevant sources were referred to, the assessment of the position of the residents/users of the town was analysed).</p>	<p>In case the matter of accessibility is not considered in the Development and Action Plans, the application cannot be recommended for funding.</p>
<p>C. Horizontal matters:</p> <p>The project is consistent with the general principles established by Articles 7 and 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • equality between men and women, 	II.9	YES/NO	<p>NOTE: If it is established that any activities violate the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination, the CPP will not be recommended for funding.</p>	

⁶ <https://www.miir.gov.pl/stromy/zadania/dlaczego-dostepnosc/>.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, nationality, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, • sustainable development, including the positive impact on the implementation of the 4R rule⁷. 				
<p>Total score and recommendations of the assessor/Potential comments</p>		<p>230 points</p>		

DECLARATION OF IMPARTIALITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Informed about penal responsibility deriving from articles 271 and 272 of Penal code I hereby declare that:

⁷ Projects are deemed to have a positive impact if they implement at least one of the following rules 4R (reduce, reuse, recycle, repair), where:

- **Reduce** means the reduction in the volume of packages and waste,
- **Reuse** means the possibility to use processed raw materials for production purposes and the possibility to reuse products,
- **Recycle** means the possibility to process packages and waste which may not be reused (it is deemed that the project will implement this rule in case the applicant intends to process the waste independently. In case the applicant intends to transfer the waste to other entities for processing, it cannot be deemed that the project implements this rule),
- **Repair** means the possibility to extend the product life cycle by repairing it economically.

1) there are no circumstances, referred to in article 24, para. 1 and 2 of Administration Procedure Code (O.J. 2020, pos. 256), which may cause my exclusion from the appraisal of this application and there are no circumstances which may undermine my impartiality with regard to the institution that submitted application that is subject to this assessment, in particular:

- I am not an applicant/ partner, I have not prepared application or I have not been involved in the project preparation at any stage;
- I am not related with applicant/ partner/ partners, its/ their legal substitutes, members of its/ their managing or supervising bodies by marriage or affinity till the second degree or I am not related with it/them by adoption, guardianship or care;
- I am not or I have not been a representative of the applicant/ partner/ partners or I am not related with a representative of an applicant/ partner/ partners by marriage or affinity till the second degree or I am not related with it/them by adoption, guardianship or care;
- I am not a subject of professional investigation, disciplinary or criminal procedure relating to this application;
- I am not related with applicant/ partner/ partners by professional subordination;

2) I hereby oblige myself to keep confidential any and all information or documents which I may be disclosed or receive or prepare in the course or as a result of the assessment. I agree that this Information should be used exclusively for the purposes of the assessment and not to disclose it to third parties.

If any of circumstances, referred to under point 1), appear, I oblige myself to inform the Programme Operator immediately.

Date: Signature: